

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

C O N F I D E N T I A L PARIS 004803

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 07/07/2006

TAGS: [PREL](#) [FR](#) [UNSC](#)

SUBJECT: DEMARCHE ON G-4 FRAMEWORK RESOLUTION ON UN REFORM:
FRENCH VIEWS

REF: A. STATE 126870

[B](#). STATE 124891

Classified By: Political Minister Counselor Josiah Rosenblatt
for reasons 1.4 (b) and (d).

[1](#). (C) PolMinCouns made ref A points to MFA IO Director Jean-Maurice Ripert July 8. Ripert said that the GOF understands the U.S. position on both the substance of the G-4 proposal, and on the process to get to both UNSC enlargement and other necessary UN reforms. While understanding our rationale, France's consideration of the issue leads it to different conclusions, which can be summed up as follows:

-- The G-4 proposal belongs to the G-4; they have every right to decide how to proceed with their initiative, including when to bring it to a head. While the U.S. may be of the view that addressing UNSC reform together with the rest of our package offers the best prospects for both, the French view is that agreement on UNSC reform -- an issue which has dragged on for 15 years and is overripe for resolution -- would provide a propitious context to achieve the optimum outcome on the larger reform package. Ripert was not swayed by the argument that such a sequence would not work, and that a G-4 failure, or a drawn-out, contentious process, was hardly the context for pushing through the other reforms that France says it supports.

-- Regarding the substance of the G-4 proposal, Ripert said that France was comfortable with a Council of 25. France's own determination of what kind of representation is needed to give the Council the desired additional "legitimacy" leads it to an enlarged Council closely resembling that put forward by the G-4. The GOF did not think the loss in efficiency and effectiveness would be as substantial as the U.S. contends.

[3](#). (C) Taking the opportunity to address a related matter -- the portion of U/S Burns' letter (ref B) on the draft Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism -- Ripert asked if the U.S. was concerned that a resumption of Sixth Committee negotiations in late July risked complicating efforts to come to closure on the terrorism paragraph in the Ping declaration. Just a thought, he said, but one he hoped we'd consider.

STAPLETON